arXiv:1303.4977v1 [quant-ph] 20 Mar 2013

Renormalization in Winter Model

U.G. Aglietti*, P.M. Santini†,

Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma "La Sapienza" and
INFN, Sezione di Roma, 00185 Rome, Italy

Abstract

We show that metastable states in Winter model can be related to the eigenstates of a particle in a box by means of renormalization and mixing.

Key words: quantum mechanics, metastable state, renormalization, mixing.

---

*Email: Ugo.Aglietti@roma1.infn.it
†Email: Paolo.Santini@roma1.infn.it

1 Introduction

The theory of unstables states in quantum mechanics [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7] has applications virtually in any branch of physics: statistical and condensed matter physics [8, 9, 10, 11, 12], atomic and molecular physics [13, 14], nucler physics [15], quantum field theory and particle physics [16] and so on.

In this note we show that the particle states inside the cavity (see eq. (5)) of the Winter model [17, 18, 19, 20, 21] can be obtained from the states of a particle in a box (see eq. (3)) by means of renormalization and mixing. Winter model describes the coupling of a cavity with the outside and is given, in the notation [21], by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{1}{\pi g}\delta(x-\pi) \tag{1}$$

in the half-line $0 \leq x < \infty$ and with vanishing boundary condition in zero: $\psi(x=0,t)=0$. $\delta(y)$ is the Dirac δ-function and g is a positive coupling. The metastable states are nothing but wave packets initially (i.e. at $t=0$) concentrated inside the cavity ($0 < x < \pi$, see eq. (4)). The time evolution of the resonances is controlled by wave propagation and imperfect multiple reflections on the cavity walls, leading to a leakage of the wave amplitude outside. For small coupling, $0 < g \ll 1$, there is weak coupling of the cavity with the outside and resonant long-lived states come into play. The idea is that, by means of them, we can describe the dynamics of the particles initially inside the cavity *as if* the outside did not exist. Let us stress however the difference between the "true", exact, eigenstates and the resonance states of (1): the former have real energies and lie in the continuum spectrum, while the latter are normalizable states with complex energy and describe dynamics in a simple but approximate way for a finite amount of time only [12]. There is however a remarkable connection between these two set of states: the continuum eigenfunctions show for quantum numbers $k \in \mathbb{R}$ close to the resonance ones $k^{(n)}(g) \in \mathbb{C}$ marked peaks inside the cavity compared to the outside [18, 21].

Our results involve a conjecture based on a second-oder computation in g extending the $\mathcal{O}(g)$ results in [21], in which we repeated the original Winter's computation, finding non-diagonal contributions in the time evolution of the resonances which were absent in [17] (see eq. (23) in the next section). These terms have a small strength $\mathcal{O}(g) \ll 1$ compared to the diagonal ones, but decay slowly in time, with the smallest decay width $\Gamma^{(1)}$ (see eq. (21)). These contributions therefore dominate the evolution of all the excited resonances ($l > 1$) at large times and cannot be neglected. In this note we show that such contributions can in principle be "rotated away" by means of a unitary transformation which accounts for most of the dynamics. The latter is actually one of the renormalization effects occurring when we switch on the coupling of the cavity with the outside (i.e. we go from $g = 0 \ \to g \neq 0$).

To show the relevance of such interpretation, let us briefly discuss the importance of renormalization in understanding the dynamics of many physical theories. It is common practise in physics to compare a given physical system with a simplified one in which some interactions are omitted. These interactions can be related to control parameters in experiments involving, for example, external electric or magnetic fields, or can be treated theoretically as variable quantities. The idea of renormalization is that switching on an interaction in a physical system has, as one of the main dynamical effects, that of modifying the parameters of the starting, non-interacting, system; once renormalization has been made, the residual effects of the interaction are substantially weaker than before renormalization. When the coupling setting the strength of the interaction gets too large, there is usually little connection between the free and the interacting system and renormalization often looses its meaning.

In condensed matter physics, renormalization is related to the so called “adiabatic continuity principle” [12]: by adiabatically (i.e. slowly) turning on an interaction, the free states of the system go $1-1$ onto the interacting states by means of a flow of the parameters such as masses, couplings, etc. A typical example is the normal Fermi liquid, i.e. a system with a repulsive interaction among electrons in the Fermi sphere [1]. In quantum field theory [22, 23, 24, 25], the relation between free parameters and interacting ones (masses, couplings and field normalizations) is often singular because of the lack of intrinsic energy scales cutting off the quantum fluctuations at large energies: that leads to the well-known ultraviolet infinities.

In classical physics, renormalization is usually implemented by the method of “multiple scales” [26, 27]. In the case of a free anharmonic oscillator, for example, renormalization amounts to the “absorption” of secular terms into a shift of the harmonic frequency. These terms are formally resonances produced by forcing terms occurring in the perturbative expansion, are incompatible with energy conservation and spoil the convergence of the perturbative expansion at large times. After renormalization, such strong-coupling effects completely disappear, only a small coupling between the harmonics is left and a uniform approximation in time is obtained.

Let us remark that the adiabatic continuity principle is subjected to relevant violations. Let us quote, for example, the cases of the energy gap in the Bardeen-Cooper-Schriffer (BCS) theory of classical superconductors [28] or the mass gap in massless Quantum-Chomo-Dynamics (QCD) [29]. These phenomena are tipically characterized by functions which have an essential singularity when the interaction coupling g goes to zero, of the form $e^{1/g}$ for $g<0$, making non smooth the connection between the interacting system and the related free one. In these cases, the relation between the free system and the interacting one is highly non trivial and the residual interaction is of nonperturbative character.

Let us end the introduction by observing that, even though renormalization is implemented and interpreted in quite different ways in different contexts, it is an ubiquitous phenomenon in physics — like the unstable states cited above — a thing which certainly could not be expected *a priori*.

2 Second-Order Computation $\mathcal{O}(g^2)$

The eigenfunctions of a particle in a box of length $L=\pi$ with Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_0 = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \tag{2}$$

---

[1] See footnote 6.

are given, as well known, by

$$\psi_0^{(l)}(x,t) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\sin(lx)e^{-il^2t}, \tag{3}$$

where $l = 1, 2, 3, \cdots$ is a positive integer and $0 \le x \le \pi$. We study the time evolution of wavefunctions $\psi^{(l)}(x,t)$ which coincide at $t = 0$ with the free eigenfunctions in eq. (3) in the interval $x \in [0, \pi]$ (the cavity) and vanish outside it:

$$\psi^{(l)}(x,0) = \left\{ \begin{array}{cl} \sqrt{2/\pi}\,\sin\left(l\,x\right) & \text{for } 0 \le x \le \pi; \\ 0 & \text{for } \pi < x < \infty\,. \end{array} \right. \tag{4}$$

In a time slice between a pre-exponential small-t region [13, 17, 21] and a post-exponential one related to a power-like decay[2] [17, 20], these wavefunctions describe mestastable states for $0 < g \ll 1$ evolving as the following sum of exponentials:

$$\psi_{exp}^{(l)}(x,t;g) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} U(g)_{ln}\xi^{(n)}(x,t;g). \tag{5}$$

Eq. (5) does not reproduce indeed the initial value in eq. (4) for $t = 0$. It is clear that non-exponential contributions do not have a resonance interpretation: they constitute an intrinsic limit of the scheme.

The infinite mixing matrix $U(g)$ has the following exact expression:

$$U(g)_{ln} = \frac{g\,(-1)^{n+l}\,2l\,k^{(n)}(g)\left[1-2\pi i\,g\,k^{(n)}(g)\right]^{1/2}}{\left[l^2-k^{(n)}(g)^2\right]\Big\{1+g\left[1-2\pi i\,k^{(n)}(g)\right]\Big\}}\frac{1}{Z^{(n)}(g)}, \tag{6}$$

where we have chosen the branch of the complex square root with $1^{1/2} = 1$. The function $k^{(n)}(g)$ is the branch with $k^{(n)}(0) = n$ of the multi-valued analytic function $k(g)$ satisfying the trascendental equation [21]

$$b(k,g) = \frac{i}{2} + \frac{1}{4\pi g k}\left[\exp\left(2\pi i k\right) - 1\right] = 0, \tag{7}$$

i.e. satisfying $b(k(g),g) = 0$; the expansion of $k^{(n)}(g)$ for small g is given in eq. (19). Let us remark that eq. (6) has been obtained by using eq. (7) to eliminate the exponential terms. The function $\xi^{(n)}(x,t;g)$ is the n-th pole wavefunction:

$$\xi^{(n)}(x,t;g) \equiv \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}Z^{(n)}(g)\sin\left[k^{(n)}(g)\,x\right]E^{(n)}(t;g). \tag{8}$$

We have multiplied and divided by the renormalization constants $Z^{(n)}(g)$'s which, contrary to [21], are still undefined and depend in general on n:

$$Z^{(n)}(g) = 1 + a^{(n)}g + b^{(n)}g^2 + \mathcal{O}\left(g^3\right), \tag{9}$$

---

[2] The explicit expression for the bounds can be found in [17, 21].

where $a^{(n)}$ and $a^{(n)}$ are complex coefficients to be determined. The pole wave-functions evolve diagonally in time with the factors

$$E^{(n)}(t;g) \;\equiv\; \exp\left[-i\,\varepsilon^{(n)}(g)\,t\right]\,. \tag{10}$$

Note that $E^{(n)}(0;g) = 1$, as it should. Since the energies are complex for $g \neq 0$, it is convenient to split them into real and imaginary parts as:

$$\varepsilon^{(n)}(g) = \left(k^{(n)}(g)\right)^2 = \omega^{(n)}(g) \,-\, \frac{i}{2}\Gamma^{(n)}(g), \tag{11}$$

where $\omega^{(n)}(g)$ is the frequency and $\Gamma^{(n)}(g)$ is the decay width of the pole state n.
To simplify formulae, it is convenient to introduce matrix notation. Ley us define an infinite column vector containing all the pole states

$$\Xi(x,t;g) \;\equiv\; \left(\begin{array}{c} \xi^{(1)}(x,t;g) \\ \xi^{(2)}(x,t;g) \\ \cdots \\ \xi^{(n)}(x,t;g) \\ \cdots \end{array}\right) \tag{12}$$

and an infinite diagonal matrix representing the evolution of the pole states

$$\mathcal{E}(t;g) \;\equiv\; \mathrm{diag}\left(E^{(1)}(t;g), E^{(2)}(t;g), \cdots, E^{(n)}(t;g), \cdots\right). \tag{13}$$

In more standard notation:

$$\mathcal{E}(t;g) \;=\; \left(\begin{array}{cccc} E^{(1)}(t;g) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & E^{(2)}(t;g) & \cdots & 0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & E^{(n)}(t;g) & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots \end{array}\right). \tag{14}$$

The temporal evolution of the pole states can be rewritten in matrix notation as:

$$\Xi(x,t;g) \;=\; \mathcal{E}(t;g)\,\Xi(x,0;g)\,. \tag{15}$$

Similarly, let us define an infinite column vector containing the metastable wavefunctions:[3]

$$\Psi(x,t;g) \;=\; \left(\begin{array}{c} \psi^{(1)}(x,t;g) \\ \psi^{(2)}(x,t;g) \\ \cdots \\ \psi^{(n)}(x,t;g) \\ \cdots \end{array}\right). \tag{16}$$

---

[3] In general, let us denote the vectors with uppercase greek letters and their components with the corresponding lowercase letters.

For $t = 0$ one obtains a list of the initial conditions for all $l = 1, 2, 3, \cdots$ (see eq. (4)):

$$\Psi(x,0) \;=\; \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \begin{pmatrix} \sin(x) \\ \sin(2x) \\ \cdots \\ \sin(nx) \\ \cdots \end{pmatrix} . \tag{17}$$

Eq. (5) reads in new notation:

$$\Psi_{exp}(x,t;g) \;=\; U(g)\;\Xi(x,t;g) \;=\; U(g)\;\mathcal{E}(t;g)\;\Xi(x,0;g). \tag{18}$$

By inserting the small-g expansion for the poles,

$$k^{(n)}(g) = n - ng + \left(n - i\pi n^2\right) g^2 + \left(\frac{4}{3}\pi^2 n^3 + 3i\pi n^2 - n\right) g^3 + \mathcal{O}\left(g^4\right), \tag{19}$$

one obtains the following explicit expressions for the coefficients entering the above wave-functions:

$$\omega^{(n)}(g) \;=\; n^2\left[1 - 2g + 3g^2\right] + \mathcal{O}\left(g^3\right), \tag{20}$$

$$\Gamma^{(n)}(g) \;=\; 4\pi n^3 g^2\left[1 \,-\, 4g\right] \,+\, \mathcal{O}\left(g^4\right). \tag{21}$$

Similarly, the mixing matrix reads:

$$\begin{aligned} U(g)_{ln} &= \delta_{ln}\left[1 - \frac{1}{2}\,g - \left(\frac{\pi^2}{6} l^2 + i\pi\frac{3}{2} l - \frac{1}{4}\right) g^2 + \mathcal{O}\left(g^3\right)\right] \frac{1}{Z^{(l)}(g)} + \\ &+\;\; (1-\delta_{ln})\left[g\,\frac{(-1)^{n+l}\,2nl}{l^2-n^2}\big(1 - g + i\pi n g\big) + g^2\,\frac{(-1)^{n+l+1}\,2nl\,(l^2+n^2)}{(l^2-n^2)^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(g^3\right)\right]\frac{1}{Z^{(n)}(g)}, \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where we have separated the diagonal ($n = l$) out of the off-diagonal ($n \neq l$) terms and δ_{ln} is the Kronecker δ. As discussed in the introduction, the diagonal term $\mathcal{O}(1)$ on the r.h.s. of eq. (22) has been originally derived in [17], while the $\mathcal{O}(g)$ non-diagonal contributions, involving the real antisimmetric matrix

$$C^{(1)}_{ln} \equiv (1-\delta_{ln})\,(-1)^{l+n}\frac{2\,l\,n}{l^2-n^2}, \tag{23}$$

have been obtained for the first time, as fas as we know, in [21]. Let us end this section by noting a typo in the statement after eq. (19) of [21]: the resonance states decay exponentially for $t \to +\infty$ *but* grow exponentially for $x \to +\infty$ — the well-known Gamow phenomenon [1, 6].

Exponentiation Conjecture

Let us now compare the results above, which are exact to O(g^2) included, with an exponentiation conjecture. By using the identities [4]

$$\sum_{k\neq m}^{1,\infty}\frac{1}{k^2-m^2} = \frac{3}{4m^2} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sum_{k\neq m}^{1,\infty}\frac{k^2}{\left(k^2-m^2\right)^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{12} + \frac{1}{16m^2}, \tag{24}$$

---

[4] These identities are obtained from $\sum_{k\neq m}^{-\infty,+\infty} 1/(k-m) = 0$ and $\sum_{k\neq m}^{-\infty,+\infty} 1/(k-m)^2 = \pi^2/3$ respectively, by splitting the sums into positive and negative indices and rearranging them in order to have a single sum. The first identity can be found in [30].

which hold for m a positive integer, one obtains

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(C^{(1)}\right)^2_{ln} = (1-\delta_{ln})\,(-1)^{n+l+1}\frac{2nl\,(l^2+n^2)}{(l^2-n^2)^2} - \delta_{ln}\left(\frac{\pi^2}{6}l^2+\frac{1}{8}\right). \tag{25}$$

Note that the squared matrix is symmetric, as it should, being the square of an antisimmetric matrix. We now assume that to $\mathcal{O}(g^2)$

$$U(g) = \exp\left[K(g)\right] + g^2 H^{(2)}, \tag{26}$$

where

$$K(g) = gK^{(1)} + g^2 K^{(2)} \tag{27}$$

is a real antisimmetric (therefore antihermitian) matrix and $H^{(2)}$ is a "remainder" matrix, taking into account residual effects not included by the exponentiation of $K(g)$. The equations (26) turn out to be compatible and the results read:

$$\begin{aligned}
Z^{(n)}(g) &= 1-\frac{g}{2}+\left(\frac{3}{8}-i\pi\frac{3}{2}n\right)g^2+\mathcal{O}\left(g^3\right); & (28)\\
K(g)_{ln} &= g\,(1-\delta_{ln})\,(-1)^{l+n}\frac{2nl}{l^2-n^2}\left[1-\frac{g}{2}+\mathcal{O}(g^2)\right]; & (29)\\
g^2 H^{(2)}_{ln} &= i\pi g^2\,(1-\delta_{ln})\,(-1)^{l+n}\frac{2ln^2}{l^2-n^2}. & (30)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $H^{(2)}$ is a purely imaginary matrix, which is neither simmetric nor antisimmetric. As reasonable in the description of quasi-particle states, decay effects are confined only approximately in the widths $\Gamma^{(n)}(g)$.
We now generalize eq. (26) to all orders in g conjecturing that

$$U(g) = \exp\left[K(g)\right] + H(g)\,, \tag{31}$$

where $K(g)$ is an antihermitian matrix possessing a series expansion in g starting in first order,

$$K(g) = \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} g^s K^{(s)}, \tag{32}$$

while $H(g)$ is an infinite matrix starting in second order in g and collecting all the structureless terms,

$$H(g) = \sum_{s=2}^{\infty} g^s H^{(s)}. \tag{33}$$

We have explicitly computed $K^{(1)}$, $K^{(2)}$ and $H^{(2)}$. We conjecture that eq. (31) provides a convenient organization of the series in g of $U(g)$, i.e. that it resums a large part of its series. To be more explicit, given as an input a truncated expansion of $U(g)$,

$$U(g) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} g^n U^{(n)}\,, \tag{34}$$

where $N < \infty$ is the order, we believe that the expression (31), involving a reorganization of the terms in eq. (34), is a much better approximation to the exact result than eq. (34) itself.

It is interesting to compare the Z's in eq. (28) with those obtained by imposing that the pole states (12) are normalized to one. By squaring the pole wave-function and integrating over $x \in [0, \pi]$, one obtains:

$$Z^{(n)}_{one}(g) = 1 - \frac{g}{2} + \left(\frac{3}{8} - i \frac{\pi}{2} n \right) g^2 + \mathcal{O}\left(g^3\right) . \tag{35}$$

The above renormalization constants coincide with the previous ones (28) to first order in g, while the imaginary contributions appearing in second order are different.

It is no surprise that the terms $g^2 H^{(2)} + g^3 H^{(3)} + \cdots$ without an exponential structure come in second order, where they are purely imaginary: they represent effects related to the decay width, which is $\mathcal{O}(g^2)$, and the latter is not a renormalization effect (see later for discussion). The terms in eq. (33) are the analogue of the imaginary contribution to $Z^{(n)}(g)$ on the r.h.s. of eq. (28).

Finally, let us note that the appearence of the combination

$$g \left(1 - \frac{g}{2} \right) \tag{36}$$

in the first line in eq. (22), as well as in the expression for $K(g)$, seems to suggest a (finite) renormalization of the coupling g of Winter model.

3 Discussion

In order to express the metastable wavefunctions of the Winter model in terms of the eigenfunctions of the particle in a box, one has to diagonalize the time evolution. That is achieved by "counter-rotating" the vector containing the initial conditions, i.e. by considering the evolution not of $\Psi(x, 0)$ but of

$$\Phi(x, 0; g) \equiv U^{-1}(g)\, \Psi(x, 0) . \tag{37}$$

By using the first equality in eq. (18), it is immediate to show that

$$\Phi(x, t; g) = \Xi(x, t; g) = \mathcal{E}(t; g)\, \Xi(x, 0; g) . \tag{38}$$

By looking at the vector equation (37) component by component, the new initial conditions read

$$\phi^{(l)}(x, 0; g) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(U^{-1}(g) \right)_{ln} \sin(nx), \tag{39}$$

each evolving as a single pole wavefunction:

$$\phi^{(l)}(x, t; g) = \xi^{(l)}(x, t; g). \tag{40}$$

The "experimental meaning" of eq. (37) or eq. (39) is clear: in order to observe a diagonal time evolution as in the free case (3), one has to prepare the initial state as the coherent superposition of free eigenfunctions given by eq. (37) or by eq. (39). In the case of excited states, $l > 1$, the superposition in eq. (37) or (39) has also the effect of subtracting the contributions from smaller l's, which decay slower in time and therefore tend to dominate the evolution, as discussed in [21]. If the matrix $U(g)$ is computed in an approximate way (as a truncated power series in g for example), there is a small residual contamination in the time evolution of the l-th state from the lower ones, which becomes substantial asymptotically in time. In other words, the problem of isolating the l-th mode for all times can in principle be solved only with an exact computation of $U(g)$.

Let us now discuss the renormalized wavefunctions $\phi^{(l)}(x,t;g)$. The main qualitative difference between the free case and the interacting one is that in the latter case there are non-zero widths. The appearence of an imaginary part in the *ab initio* real energy is a second order effect in g[5]. Once a non-zero width is allowed, the key point is that the $\phi^{(l)}(x,t;g)$'s have a similar form to the eigenfunctions of the free system $\psi_0^{(l)}(x,t)$ in eq. (3). The differences between the free case and the interacting one, so long as $0 < g \ll 1$, can be relegated to small modifications of the parameters entering the free wavefunctions $\psi_0^{(l)}(x,t)$. In other words, switching on the interaction, i.e. going from $g = 0$ to $0 < g \ll 1$, produces finite renormalizations only. Let us discuss these renormalizations in turn:

1. the normalization coefficient $Z^{(l)}(g)$ has a modulus smaller than one for $0 < g \ll 1$ and reduces to 1 in the free case $g = 0$; it has a first-order correction in g and is the analog of the field renormalization constant Z in quantum field theory, which is in general smaller than one [21]. Unlike the most common cases (consider QED for example), $Z^{(l)}(g)$ is not real because the one-particle states are unstable;

2. the wave-vector $k^{(n)}(g)$ is renormalized to first order in g by the interaction and reduces to the free case for $g \to 0$: $k^{(l)}(0) = l$. It acquires an imaginary part in second order in g, related to the decay width. That implies the disappearence of the node of the wavefunction around $x = \pi$ and a (small) exponential growth of $\phi^{(l)}(x,t;g)$ by going from the impermeable wall in $x = 0$ toward the permeable one in $x = \pi$;

3. the real part of the energy $\omega^{(l)}(g)$ is also renormalized to first order in g by the interaction and reduces to the free case for $g \to 0$: $\omega^{(l)}(0) = l^2$. Note that the free dispersion relation $\omega = k^2$ is not renormalized in first order.

Let us make a few remarks.

- We do not expand in powers of g the wavefunctions $\phi^{(l)}(x,t;g)$, but only the parameters $k^{(n)}(g)$, $\omega^{(n)}(g)$, etc. entering them through the functions appearing in $\psi_0^{(l)}(x,t)$. That implies that we are resumming classes of higher order corrections in g in the wave function, in the spirit of renormalization in quantum field theory [22, 23, 24, 25] and statistical mechanics [31] or the method of multiple scales in classical physics [27];

- The decay widths grow faster with increasing n than the frequencies:

$$\Gamma^{(n)}(g) \propto n^3, \qquad \omega^{(n)}(g) \propto n^2. \tag{41}$$

---

[5] Non zero widths are clearly not in contradiction with the unitarity of the fundamental thery because we are looking at a subsystem, an "open" system [4, 19].

Since our renormalized theory has meaning only for

$$\Gamma^{(n)}(g) \ll \omega^{(n)}(g), \tag{42}$$

we cannot take n too large. Therefore, while in principle the state vectors and the evolution/mixing matrices are infinite, in pratice for any fixed g one has to make a truncation in n according to the condition (42) [6]. This limitation is also reasonable from physics viewpoint: high energy particles pass through the barrier in $x = \pi$ without difficulty and therefore there is no sense in including them to describe the dynamics inside the cavity. By restricting on n one is also cutting off small wavelenghts $\lambda \lesssim 2\pi/n$ and therefore is limiting space resolution.

4 Conclusions

We have shown that the resonant states of the Winter model can be related to the states of a particle inside an impenetrable box by means of renormalization of the parameters entering the “free” eingenfunctions and mixing of the states, after allowing for non-zero widths. The less trivial aspect of this renormalization procedure is related to a term which was overlooked in [17] and has been found in [21]: the initial resonant states (at $t = 0$) have to be properly “counter-rotated” by means of the infinite matrix $U(g)^{-1}$, the inverse of the state mixing matrix $U(g)$, in order to have a diagonal, exponential time evolution. We have explicitly computed $U(g)$ to second order in $g \ll 1$ and we have conjectured a general form for $U(g)$ involving a unitary matrix plus a matrix collecting residual decay effects (see eq. (31)). The unitary matrix is the exponential of an antihermitian matrix, to be computed order by order in g — a typical phenomenon in quantum field theory.

References

[1] G. Gamow, *Zur Quantentheorie der Atomkernes*, Z. Phys. 51, p. 204 (1928).

[2] *“Unstable States in the Continuous Spectra, Part I: Analysis, Concepts, Methods and Results”*, in Advances in Quantum Chemistry, vol.60 (2010), Elsevier, volume edited by C. A. Nicolaides and E. Brändas (Series Editors J. S. Sabin and E. Brändas).

[3] *“Unstable States in the Continuous Spectra, Part II: Interpretations, Theory and Applications”*, in Advances in Quantum Chemistry, vol.63 (2012), Elsevier, volume edited by C. A. Nicolaides and E. Brändas (Series Editors J. S. Sabin andE. Brändas).

[4] N. Hatano, K. Sasada, H. Nakamura and T. Petrosky, *“Some Properties of the Resonant State in Quantum Mechanics and Its Computation”*, Prog. Theor. Phys. Vol. 119 n. 2 pag. 187 (2008) and references therein.

---

[6] In general, in the theory of elementary excitations, one only considers states lying slightly above the ground state [12]. In the case of normal Fermi liquids, for example, one only considers electrons slightly above the Fermi surface, i.e. with $\epsilon_k \equiv k^2/(2m) - E_F \ll E_F$, where E_F is the Fermi energy. An electron slightly above the Fermi surface is an unstable state because it can hit an electron slightly below it creating a pair. In this case $\Gamma_k \propto \epsilon_k^2$, i.e. the width increases with the square of the excitation energy.

[5] A. Degasperis and L. Fonda, *Does the life-time of an Unstable Particles Depend on the Measuring Apparatus?*, Il Nuovo Cimento vol. 21, n. 3 (1974).

[6] A. Goussev, R. Shubert, H. Waalkens and S. Wiggins, *Quantum Theory of Reactive Scattering in Phase Space*, chap. 5 in [2].

[7] For a sistematic discussion of scattering theory, see for example: R. Newton, *Scattering of Waves and Particles*, Dover Publications, Inc. Mineola, New-York (2004); M. Goldberger and K. Watson, *Collision Theory*, Dover Publications, Inc. Mineola, New-York (2002).

[8] I. Paidarova and P. Durand, *Unstables States: From Quantum Mechanics to Statistical Physics*, chap. 1 in [2].

[9] O. Atabek, R. Lefebre and T. T. Nguyen-Dang, *Unstables States in Laser Assisted and Controlled Molecular Processes*, chap. 2 in [2].

[10] I. Thanopulos and M. Shapiro, *Coherence Effects in Laser-Induced Continuum Structure*, chap. 3 in [2].

[11] M. Stobinska, G. Alber and G. Leuchs, *Quantum Electrodynamics of One-Photon Wave Packets*, chap. 8 in [2].

[12] P. W. Anderson, *Basic Notions of Condensed Matter Physics*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company (1984), chap. 3; see also: P. W. Anderson, *Concepts in Solids*, World Scientific, Singapore (1997), chap. 3.

[13] C. A. Nicolaides, *Theory and State-Specific Methods for the Analysis and Computations of Field-Free and Field-Induced Unstable States in Atoms and Molecules*, chap. 4 in [2].

[14] T. Mercouris, Y. Komninos and C. A. Nicolaides, *The State-Specific Expansion Approach to the Solution of the Polyelectronic Time-dependent Schrödinger Equation for Atoms and Molecules in Unstables States*, chap. 6 in [2].

[15] For applications to Winter's model to $\alpha-$decay see for example: E. Segre, *Nuclei and Particles*, W.A. Benjamin Inc., New-York (1965).

[16] For a treatment of unstable states in quantum field theory see: L. Maiani and M. Testa, *Unstables Systems in Relativistic Quantum Field Theory*, Ann. of Phys. vol. 263, n. 2, pag. 353 (1998) amd references threin.

[17] R. G. Winter, *"Evolution of a Quasi-Stationary State,"* Phys. Rev. **123**, n. 4, pag. 1503 (1961).

[18] S. Flügge, *Practical Quantum Mechanics*, Springer-Verlag (Berlin), Second Edition, 1994 (translated from the original german 1947 edition): problem n. 27, *"Virtuals levels"*.

[19] G. Garcia-Calderon, *Theory of Resonant States: an Exact Analytical Approach for Open Quantum Systems*, chap. 7, pag. 438-442 in [2].

[20] E. Torrontegui, J. G. Muga, J. Martorell and D. W. L. Sprung, *Quantum Decay at Long Times*, pag. 495-496, 507-510, (513-515 and 527-529), chap. 9 in [2].

[21] U.G. Aglietti and P.M. Santini, *"Analysis of a Quantum Mechanical Model for Unstable Particles"*, Rome1 preprint ROME1/1471-10, arXiv:1010.5926v2 [quant-ph]

[22] For a simple sketch on renormalization in quantum field theory, see for example: B. Delamotte, *A Hint on Renormalization*, hep-th/0212049.

[23] G. P. Lepage, *What is Renormalization?*, arXiv:hep-ph/0506330v1 30 Jun 2005.

[24] For renormalization of QED, see for example: F. Mandl and G. Shaw, *Quantum Field Theory*, J. Wiley and Sons, Chichester (1984).

[25] Zinn-Justin, *Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena*, 4-th edition, 1054 pages, Oxford University Press (2002).

[26] L. D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, *Mechanics*, Volume 1 of A Course of Theoretical Physics, Pergamon Press 1969.

[27] A. Nayfeh and D. Mook, *Non-Linear Oscillations*, Wiley-VCH, Weinheim (2004).

[28] J. Bardeen, L. N. Cooper and J.R. Schrieffer, Phys, Rev. 97 (6): 1724.

[29] M. Bochicchio, *Glueballs in large-N YM by localization on critical points*, arXiv:1107.4320v4 [hep-th] 20 Feb 2012.

[30] I. S. Gradstein and I. H. Ryshik, *Table of Series, Products and Integrals*, Harri Deutsch Verlag, Frankfurt (1981).

[31] See for example: S. K. Ma, *Modern Theory of Critical Phenomena*, Frontiers in Physics (1976), Addison-Wesley Publishing Company; J. J. Binney, N. J. Dowrick, A. J. Fisher and M. E. Newman, *The Theory of Critical Phenomena — An Introduction to the Renormalization Group*, Oxford Science Publications 1993.